DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 327 HE 004 477

AUTHOR Glenny, Lyman A.; And Others
TITLE A Survey of Research and Perspectives on National Planning for Higher Education. A Report to the Academy for Educational Development.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
PUB DATE May 69
NOTE 59p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Administration; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; Federal Aid; *Higher Education; Management; Objectives; *Planning; Research; Surveys

ABSTRACT

This report of a survey of research and perspectives on national planning for higher education is organized in two sections. Section I of this report reflects the collective professional assessment of the views held by staff members of approximately 36 research agencies on planning, the existing state of planning, the several federal aid proposals, and the future of research for higher education. Included also is an interpretation of the special significance these opinions have for research and planning at the national level. Section II describes the current and projected research of agencies and reports opinions about areas that have been neglected and future needs for research. The section ends with a list of research agencies that have especially promising potential for aiding in national planning efforts. (MJM)

ED 081327

The Center for
Research and Development in
Higher Education

A SURVEY OF RESEARCH AND PERSPECTIVES ON NATIONAL PLANNING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

A Report to the Academy for Educational Development

Lyman A. Glenny
Leland L. Medsker
Ernest G. Palola
James G. Paltridge

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE004477

University of California, Berkeley

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

A SURVEY OF RESEARCH AND PERSPECTIVES ON NATIONAL PLANNING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

A Report to the Academy for Educational Development

Lyman A. Glenny
Leland L. Medsker
Ernest G. Palola
James G. Paltridge

Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

May, 1969

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Section I

Perspectives on National Planning and Federal Aid for Higher Education

National Planning 7

Federal Aid 13

Alternative Futures for Higher Education 16

Section II

Current and Projected Research

Current Research Activities 25

Perceived Gaps and Vacuums in Research 29

Possible Research Agencies for National Planning 34

Appendix 1 Institutions and Organizations Surveyed 47

Appendix 2 Interview Questionnaire 51

Appendix 3 Proposed Project 54

INTRODUCTION

With increasing frequency, Congressmen, federal budgeteers, and numerous officials both within and outside higher education at state and national levels, raise the question: What research is used to support policy decisions and to evaluate the results of policy implementation, and what is the adequacy, character, and validity of the research used? Because there is a widespread feeling that policy-making at all levels in higher education rests on factual and analytical grounds that are shaky, and that policy fails to reflect either the realities of the educational process or the content of education, further queries are spawned about who is doing the kind of research essential for sound planning and development, and who is best qualified to do it.

The federal government, through a variety of programs, has sponsored both project and programmatic research. What additional areas of study, issues, and problems require attention? Which agencies are or should be capable of providing the kind of research necessary for national planning and for setting policy on federal programs? Who at the federal level should be responsible for national planning and for underwriting the extensive research needed to support it?

In response to these and other considerations, the U.S. Office of Education contracted with the Academy of Educational Development

to survey the whole spectrum of higher educational agencies to determine how such questions should be answered.

The Goals of the Study

As one phase of the Academy's National Planning Project, the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education agreed to conduct a series of visits and interviews with key staff members of approximately three dozen research agencies. The group of agencies was not a sample; it was composed of those considered to have a potential for conducting research of high quality which could contribute to national planning efforts.

More specifically, the Center agreed:

1. To obtain information about the content and process of current planning in higher education, and the kinds of activities agencies are engaged in that relate to planning in higher education (e.g., research on planning, actual planning, etc.).
2. To determine which centers have high potential for providing the kind of research necessary for effective planning in higher education, and to assess current vacuums in research and current and future problem areas.
3. To seek views about alternative mechanisms and goals for national planning in higher education, with specific reference to the several futuristic models suggested for the organization and structure of higher education.
4. To gather opinions about the suggestions which have been

made for providing federal financial aid to higher education.

Methodology

The initial list of research agencies was compiled on the basis of the Center research staff's personal knowledge and the Inventory of Literature in Higher Education.* During the early interviews, several agencies mentioned to the staff were investigated and in some cases included. As a result, the original list of 36 agencies was expanded to more than 40.

The directors or senior researchers at each agency were contacted by telephone before making a visit. This practice allowed prospective interviewees time to give advance thought to the subject, clarified that several agencies should be eliminated from the list of visits, and made it possible to conduct short telephone interviews in instances where the research under way or projected turned out to have limited relevance to our focus of attention.

The individual interviews were planned for one or two hours each, although several were much longer than this. Occasionally, two or more persons were interviewed simultaneously, and this was encouraged as a way of getting an "agency view," but because of scheduling difficulties more individual than group interviews were held. Interviewees were generally reassured of the confidentiality of their responses.

---

*The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Inventory of Current Research on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

An interviewing instrument (see Appendix 2) was developed to guide the four staff members who made the agency visits. Most questions in the schedule were open-ended.

The Agencies and Their Representatives

The distinguishing characteristic of the agencies visited was their heterogeneity. No two were alike and few were similar. Some were in fact no more than a loose confederation of faculty members working individually on discrete projects and tied together through common funding under a Center title. Indeed, certain agencies consisted of fewer than a half-dozen people. At the other extreme were agencies employing a hundred or more persons and engaged in huge programs of research, much of it supported by contracts with private corporations, governments, or foundations.

Other elements of diversity were evident. Whereas one agency had three researchers, each working independently on the same subject, some agencies had several different projects of programmed, interdisciplinary research under way, each of which involved a number of persons working as a team, in addition to numerous individual projects.

The subjects of research also covered a very wide range. Some agencies had a few projects on a single subject in higher education, whereas some, such as Brookings and Battelle, were engaged in a variety of social, economic and political research, only a portion of which might be relevant to our present concern.

The persons interviewed were equally diverse with respect to

their knowledgeability and closeness to the details of development in higher education of a national nature. Some were professional researchers who, as it turned out, were not working on problems closely associated with higher education; others were faculty members, working on subjects relevant to higher education, but not particularly informed about or interested in national planning or funding of higher education; and still others expressed intense interest in the details of the several proposals for a national advisory body and for federal aid, and were well acquainted with them.

Organization of the Report

Section I of this report reflects our collective professional assessment of the views held by those interviewed on planning, the existing state of planning, the several federal aid proposals, and the future and research needs of higher education. Included also is our staff interpretation of the special significance these opinions have for research and planning at the national level.

Section II describes the current and projected research of the agencies and reports opinions about areas which have been neglected and future needs for research. The section ends with a list of research agencies which have especially promising potential for aiding in national planning efforts.

Acknowledgments

We wish to acknowledge with appreciation the spirit of cooperation evidenced by the senior staff members of the agencies included in this study. They cooperated graciously in lengthy

interviews and gave serious thought to making candid responses, often followed by letters which enlarged on or clarified their comments.

SECTION I

PERSPECTIVES ON NATIONAL PLANNING AND FEDERAL AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

National Planning

We concluded that the range of opinion and knowledge about the subject of planning for higher education, particularly at the national level, is about the same for the group of researchers interviewed as for faculties in general--from very little knowledge to very sophisticated and thoughtful views. Many persons knew of institutions with long-range plans and of states which were presumably operating under master plans for the public system of higher education. Few knew about the details of any of these plans, and fewer still were familiar with the processes which preceded their adoption. Those who were knowledgeable were the experts or semi-experts in the field of planning, such as the directors of the regional state compacts (the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the Southern Regional Education Board), the administrators of university-based centers for research in higher education, and professors who were consultants and scholars on the subject of state planning. The others were, for the most part, at the other extreme with respect to information; few were half-knowledgeable.

Those most familiar with state planning were also most likely

to know about the several current proposals for national planning, although occasionally others were also aware and had given some thought to the subject.

The general views on the desirability of national planning ran the whole gamut from outright opposition, to little affection coupled with a belief that more comprehensive and integrated planning was inevitable, to the conviction that existing federal legislation on higher education clearly showed the need for and desirability of such planning.

The majority of those interviewed had all of the usual reservations about national control of education through a "national plan." At the same time, they recognized that large sums of money were not likely to be awarded either to states or institutions for instructional purposes without more planning than had gone into the categorical grant programs now in existence. They had reluctantly come to the conclusion that some type of advisory body was necessary to counsel federal officialdom and Congress.

While the majority of the interviewees felt the need for an advisory body of some sort, only a minority would have that body engage in large-scale research efforts. This reservation appeared to arise from the fear that "control," rather than planning, would result from the amassing of substantive data. Most interviewees can thus be depicted as conservatives when it comes to planning, and somewhat naive about the bases necessary for making sound plans with a chance for success.

Although this generally conservative reaction tended to prevail,

a number of persons were favorably disposed toward national planning and also toward a viable means for bringing plans into existence. The following subsections deal with the suggestions which were made with respect to national goals, planning machinery (including official relationships to institutions and the government), and pitfalls in planning at any level.

Objectives of National Planning

Most suggestions about goals were stated in general terms, such as "policy development" or "legislative proposals," but others were fairly specific. The most often cited goal was to use planning and aid for encouraging needed change in educational practice. Interviewees wanted policy recommendations on support for experimental and innovative programs, on priorities for research areas and emphases, on vocational and technical training programs, on education for the disadvantaged (generally interpreted as low income rather than black), on federal aid formulas, and on means for encouraging quality while serving vast numbers of students.

From their criticisms of existing federal programs, one surmizes they felt that such planning also should be concerned with the impact made on the effectiveness and functions of institutions by particular, categorical programs of aid, and by the emphases on funding certain research areas as opposed to others. Many were certain that policy must be developed to stabilize amounts of aid so as to allow institutions to plan for more than a year at a time. Another often cited objective was the need to preserve a wide variety

of sources for granting federal aid while encouraging the idea of coordinated planning.

Machinery for National Planning

There was no widespread agreement on the type of agency which should be formed, on its membership, or on the place it should fill in the federal hierarchy. Most favored were such models as the Council of Economic Advisors, the Brookings Institution, and the National Science Foundation. A number favored an advisory body larger than the Council of Economic Advisors, but with a similarly powerful position in relation to the White House. A minority appeared to favor a large representative body which would form policy. The prevailing view seemed to favor an advisory group rather than a policy-making body.

Whether purely advisory or not, the recommended relationships to the executive and legislative branches were ambiguous at best. Those who thought a small group might be formed similar to the Council of Economic Advisors also tended to favor a direct avenue of communication with the President's office. This type of body was seen by a few as consisting of outstanding educators who would make "pronouncements" on the full range of educational topics at all levels, from pre-elementary through graduate school. More persons, however, favored the idea of having a somewhat larger group (10-20 people) advise the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and then letting the department carry on from that point. A few researchers thought it desirable to continue to use ad hoc committees and

congressional hearings rather than any new machinery.

One national authority on organization and administration insisted that any body formed should be purely advisory and that it should deal directly with the Office of Education. He was much concerned that the bureaucracy of the Office of Education not be bypassed in any way, arguing that if a new body with its own research arm were created, the quality of personnel in OE would deteriorate rather than improve. He stated emphatically that no policy or advisory group should have a staff composed of persons not in the Office of Education.

This position was not shared by most of the others interviewed, but few of them had given intensive thought to the problem of organizational relationship. There were several suggestions on this topic. Some wanted a separation between policy-making and information-gathering. Others wanted complete independence from any government agency.

Another expert favored a high-level commission for all education, headed by the Secretary of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. This body would be composed of panels, each representing a different type or level of education, and the Commission would not only advise HEW, but would also counsel Congress and the President on all matters related to maximizing educational opportunities.

While most others favored creation of an advisory body to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, there was little agreement on the composition of such a group. Some were opposed in principle to allowing representatives of the several special interest groups to come together to bargain and logroll in the name of the public

interest. Others had little enthusiasm for a "representative" body, but could see no clear alternative--particularly since a small policy group would also be composed of educators who no doubt would have their own biases and special interests. A third group favored a small council of renowned people, not wholly selected from the ranks of educators, who would be selected for their breadth and statesmanship. Those who favored this idea were often the same people who favored the Council of Economic Advisors model. Objections specifically raised to membership sources seemed directed most against professional education agencies or institutions as such. Suggestions were made on the qualifications of members ("renowned," "outstanding," etc.), but these were not sufficiently specific to offer more than a general guideline.

Of the specific proposals for a national planning or advisory body which have been made public, the one most often mentioned favorably was that of the Carnegie Commission. There was only a little support for each of the other proposals, possibly because most people were less familiar with them. The ad hoc and generally conservative characteristics of all the proposals were mentioned as objections.

Several cautions were offered about planning efforts and their likely success. Opinions about why plans at any level tend to fail have relevance here. The three major reasons mentioned for failure, given in order of frequency, were: lack of sufficient research data and empirical information to support the plan; plans, or at least the people preparing them, frequently did not address themselves to the right problems; and planning agencies lacked the status and power to

provide effective continuing implementation or left the implementation to another agency which was not wholly committed to the plan. Other specific failures were attributed to a lack of concern for the future, lack of money, and lack of a continuing planning agency.

Federal Aid

Many more people were familiar with proposals for federal aid than with those for national planning. Interest in the subject was also greater.

Aid to Students

The vast majority of all persons interviewed favored the giving of aid to students. Reasons offered for this preference as against giving aid to other recipients, including institutions and states, were: (1) low-income students would be better encouraged to attend college; (2) by selecting the colleges of their choice, students would force a favorable competition among institutions to offer quality programs; (3) institutions would offer what the student wanted or thought he needed, thus lessening the validity of charges of lack of relevance; (4) institutions which are weak or poor would be forced to close; (5) new experimental colleges would be helped; (6) students would be able to enroll in programs not usually found in their state or locality; and (7) the mobility of students between types of institutions and across state lines would be greatly increased.

It was stipulated, however, that procedures for giving aid to low-income students must be much more simplified than existing practice. Otherwise, prospective students will not complete complicated forms

and thus will not take advantage of their opportunity. A number of people also expressed their strong belief that an aid-to-student plan should be designed in a way that would not penalize the lower end of the middle-income group. They pointed to the increasing financial difficulties which families with $10,000-$15,000 a year encountered in trying to send several children to college.

Other Forms of Aid

Much support was also expressed for aid given directly to institutions, but the form of aid was not agreed upon. Serious reservations were expressed about the giving of block or blanket grants to individual colleges and universities, especially nonpublic ones. This, it was felt, encouraged survival of the poor institutions along with those of better quality, at the same time that it provided funds to some institutions already well financed. Some objections were also made, however, to the categorical method of distributing funds to institutions, at least by use of current methods. Some sentiment favored categorical grants or contracts for aid to nonpublic institutions and for encouraging substantive changes in that system.

Several interviewees favored giving grants through the states and through regional compact organizations, and still others thought that more aid should be given directly to these organizations to improve their capabilities for planning.

Our overall impression is that the people in research favor aid to students, but also appear unwilling to rule out entirely categorical aid or even some types of block grants. They had quite

mixed feelings on each type of aid (except that to students). They seemed to know the advantages as well as disadvantages of each, but were not willing to make a final decision on the individual type of aid they favored over all others. The inclination seemed to be for a "package" of different kinds of aids rather than for one type to the exclusion of other types.

Several persons stated that each "package" of aids, by the nature of the particular combination, would have strengths and weaknesses different from some other combination. The research people evidently would approve of packages such as those of Rivlin and the Kerr Commission, and be less favorably disposed toward the Bowen and Wesco proposals, because of their greater emphasis on grants to institutions.

Beyond the types of aid which they thought ought to be promoted, the several persons interviewed expressed fears of any total program which was so closely coordinated as to allow allocation and distribution by a single bureau or agency in the federal government. They wished to see aid administered through a number of different offices and departments so that if some major administrative or political problem arose in relation to one source of funds, other channels would remain open. This consideration merits some attention, even though a major contribution by a national planning agency may and should be a better rationalizing of all aid programs to higher education.

Lastly, of those who referred to random proposals for aid in education, all who mentioned tax credits were unequivocably opposed to them.

Alternative Futures for Higher Education

"Conservative" might best describe the overall view of the future of higher education as expressed in interviews with agency personnel. Not many comments conveyed a sense of optimism or excitement about planning for the future. Tough problems rather than imaginative prospects served most often as examples of anticipated change. While the views of a majority seemed to be of rather short range, it is the few with sensitivity to current trends, to new approaches, and to value change who almost invariably lead the thinking and eventually the practice for the future. Men of vision are not more numerous among researchers than among other professional segments of the population. Most thinking about the future gave attention to one or two characteristics rather than to a thought-out pattern for all elements relating to higher education.

The majority of opinions on the future focused on new forms of financing, new patterns of organization, and new teaching/learning processes. In general, opinions ranged from sensing a need for more order to anticipating greater variety and flexibility in both the form and the content of higher education.

Financing

Some comment in relation to federal aid for the immediate future was cited previously. For the long range, anticipations point to a greatly increased role for the federal government in financing as well as in determining new directions in education. While federal funds pay for most of the research at present, it aids direct

education in only minor ways, primarily for vocational and technical career programs. Some see federal financing of the largest portion of all three functions commonly performed by colleges and universities. These expectations go far beyond the projected level of spending and functions to be funded under any current proposal. It is through federal intervention in the financing of this increased proportion of post high school education that much change can be brought about. In other words, money plus a plan can bring about innovations which will revolutionalize higher education. Researchers appeared to accept the often made statement that fundamental reform in any social institution is initially a response to outside pressure. Pressure in this case can be federal funding of categorical activities and the stipulated rules, regulations, and standards to be observed in spending the money.

Those interviewed from the regional compacts felt that state master planning and regional agreements were already bringing about needed change, but that while plans may be good, they cannot be adequately financed from state and local sources. They and several others also opined that federal aid ought to be given these planning organizations in order to strengthen them as necessary adjuncts to national planning and implementation. This concept seems to call for some federal aid to be administered through state organizations similar to those required for current administration of categorical programs for construction, continuing education, and technical services; or for federal block grants to be administered under a "state plan" developed by a state coordinating and planning board for higher education. Both of these means for future dispensing of funds

should no doubt be considered along with direct aid to students or institutions.

Planning and Organization

The views about planning were in line with views about the future for organization. Many researchers expected (often with a good deal of regret) that higher education would become more and more centralized in its operations. They saw state coordinating boards and budgeting organizations as probable instrumentalities for increasing power and control, with individual institutions making fewer final decisions about their own chosen directions. National plans and particularly national sources of funds, as previously mentioned, were also seen as such centralizing and controlling forces.

National planning, then, must take cognizance of what is happening to organization, planning, and control at state and regional levels if national policies are to augment and guide rather than run contrary to local policy.

Historically, the primary reason given for federal assumption of control over a given service area, such as welfare, health, transportation, etc., has been that the states neither plan adequate services nor fund them at a level commensurate with need. Lack of state effort has thus encouraged federal intervention in the past. To the extent that states are not planning for higher education, a similar vacuum may exist, or it may be that certain national interests are not accommodated within the collective plans of the states. Nevertheless, the regional compacts and many states have taken the initiative in

developing statewide master plans and interstate agreements for improving quality and furnishing means by which large numbers of new students may be enrolled. The federal government has given little aid to higher education, except for research, and therefore has not helped financially in implementation of state and regional planning.

It would be a mistake now for the federal government to assume that state master plans and coordinating agencies should be ignored by a new federal organization for planning, at least not until national financial support for education exceeds state support.

On this point, other researchers foresaw an increasing differentiation of institutions, with a few distinguished institutions heavily involved in research and the others devoted to instruction. This kind of specialization of function in order to provide diversity of opportunity and conserve resources has been one of the principal goals of statewide coordinating boards.

New Institutions and Organizations

The futurists also saw new types of institutions developing and additional educational activity by private business and other federal governmental agencies, especially the military. New institutions mentioned were technical institutes, or at least occupationally oriented colleges more specialized than the community college, and new colleges or universities which will give no lower division work, but start with the upper division and go through one or more graduate years. The future will also include both industry and the military

as agencies sharing in educational responsibilities, especially for technical and service training.

The most visionary prospects were for an entirely different concept of a college or a university. The institution and its structure, as well as its organization at extra-institutional levels, would be a result of new modes of offering college work to students. This change may grow out of the predicted massive use of programmed instruction, educational television, and interacting computer instruction. These trends, coupled with the emphasis on individualizing the instruction and content of degree programs, may call for "formal" instruction to take place off-campus as much as on it, and more by electronics and individual study than by classes "taught" by faculty on campus. Or if it takes place on campus, the library may be the focal point for technological instruction rather than the classroom.

If these estimates of the future, which are indeed based upon some current trends, come to pass, entirely new means of structuring and organizing higher education will be necessary. Planning for such change, however, does not appear far along at the moment.

This decentralization of education also has important ramifications for federal funding. It will affect what building and other construction is to be undertaken, who should build, and who or what agencies should get funds for providing the decentralized and individualized education.

If, as two of our most visionary researchers predict, students will study at home most of what is now taught in the first two years of college, some entirely new thinking must take place. One

of these men only half facetiously suggested that the equipment, terminals, programs, and tape cassettes for this kind of instruction might be supplied most effectively and efficiently by Sears or the Bell Telephone Company. Such an eventuality or one similar to it may be planned for or planned against. Because of high initial costs, national planning and federal funding will have great influence on the magnitude of individual and computer instruction, the places they are to be offered, and the means which will be employed.

Two other predicted changes for institutions also would have ramifications for organization. One is that the new centers and institutes for encouraging interdisciplinary studies may compete so successfully with the traditional departments that they may replace them entirely. Another is that student counseling and other student personnel activities will be increasingly decentralized, both to a greater number of faculty members and to living quarters and recreational areas.

As a last point on organization, several interviewees felt that an increase in federal control would help offset the increasing politicization of state colleges and universities. Political intervention would be likely to increase, not only because of student unrest, but also because colleges will be more active in community affairs, thus placing them in politically controversial positions in relation to a state governor and legislature as well as to local interest groups.

The New Teaching

Most researchers were agreed that TV, computer-programmed instruction, and self-study were on the ascendancy. Several people indicated that the consequences of saving the time and energies of professors would allow for great improvement in education at the more advanced levels. Such education would be less concerned with facts and more with values, less professor-centered and more peer-group oriented, and less elicited from secondary sources and more allied to research participation and findings. As one researcher put it, "We will go from a passive learning environment to an active learning one."

A great many substantive changes were also forecast in relation to the process and procedure for instruction. Great attempts will be made to "break the lock-step and blur the disciplines and departments." Predictions were for changes in the grading system to the point of elimination of both grades and credits, and the introduction of other forms of evaluation. The reward system for faculty members will also emphasize teaching more than in the past. The school calendar will be much changed, with a variety of experiments on improving both the quality of the educational experience and efficiency in use of time.

Students will have a greater variety of opportunity to fit their education into a program which will allow them greater ease in making a living while attending college. Colleges will offer more courses and full programs in community centers rather than on campuses. They will organize short sessions, hold seminars, and

generally decentralize the place of offering instruction. Colleges will become a true part of the community rather than just being located in it.

Under these conditions, students will also be in and out of college more frequently, with education becoming a life-long process, and even degree programs being extended over time to encourage students to "pace themselves" to their work needs and academic capabilities.

A major challenge which few researchers speculated on is that of educating to their fullest potential those who are educationally disadvantaged and those who fall in the lower half academically by high school rank or test scores. Computer-programmed instruction plus TV were thought by a few to offer the most hope for a massive attack on this problem. One researcher perhaps got to the heart of the matter when he stated that what is offered now by colleges is only appropriate for about one-third of our youth. He felt the need of greater efforts to keep colleges up to the rapid changes occurring in the society.

Lastly, the futurists saw a much greater mobility in higher education--between high school and college, among higher institutions, and across state lines. This trend derives from general affluence and from the increasing aid given by states and the federal government to individual students. Researchers felt that for the student to be able to select programs and institutions without some of the current legal and financial constraints would be highly beneficial. Each student should have the universe of colleges and universities within the nation from which to choose. This goal will of course be circumscribed by the admissions standards of individual institutions and

the quotas for out-of-state students now being considered by a few state legislatures. Once again, planning for or against these objectives would be of concern at national levels.

While the changes suggested as possible or probable for the future were not as comprehensive for higher education as one might expect, the following section, which describes vacuum areas in research as seen by those interviewed, give additional hints of the future, or at least of change. Some of these research subjects have been studied so little in depth that researchers seemingly cannot detect trends which portend their future developments. If this assumption is correct, one of the first objectives of a national planning group should be development of a research program which gives priority in funding to those seemingly important areas which are now little understood.

SECTION II

CURRENT AND PROJECTED RESEARCH

Current Research Activities

Review of the current research and development activities of the various agencies indicates their concern with subjects which might best be regarded as ingredients of planning rather than the actual planning process--the synthesizing of the ingredients. The bulk of the research is oriented toward the institutional level. There is a rapid decline in the number of projects as the scale of consideration moves from the institutional level to state, regional, and national levels. This finding is not surprising, since the vast majority of states now have state coordinating and planning boards, some of which do extensive statewide research (not included as part of this survey). Several of the statements about anticipated research, however, indicate a possibility of increasing interest and commitment to the supra-institutional levels of higher education.

Many agencies explicitly stated that their own work is not related to policy formulation or planning, and in some cases agencies were not focusing on higher education. However, in both of these situations it is reasonable to expect that many of their concepts, methodologies, and findings will have potential transfer value to the study of planning in higher education. Those agencies with

activities related directly to policy or planning matters exhibited projects covering a broad spectrum of relevant considerations. Some ongoing research is aimed toward determining the sociological dimensions important to both the present and future shape of higher education. Other research focuses on the generation and evaluation of alternative futures relating to society in general and higher education in particular. Also, some effort is being directed toward identifying and examining innovations in higher education.

Particularly noticeable is the degree to which "problem oriented" research is being conducted. Within this context are studies of: the relationships of educationally disadvantaged individuals, both black and white, to the junior colleges in the south; of an urban university to its community; and of institutions to each other and to states and/or regions. The two regional agencies appear to be prime movers in this regard. One of the latter is engaged in a fourteen-state effort to develop a model management information system which initially would allow cross-state comparisons of unit costs, and subsequently comparisons of other data. Two agencies have developed and are promoting simulation models for institutional use of computer-based institutional planning. Four are working on the refinement of computerized management/educational information systems.

Finally, in the area of specific research in policy and planning, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions deserve special mention. Although each operates in a different manner and neither conducts research

investigations in the "traditional" sense of the word, both are continuing to perform unique functions relative to the stimulation and criticism of policy and planning activities. Each of these agencies is described at the end of this section.

Less directly related to the planning process and policy development are studies concentrated in the following five general categories:

1. Most predominant are studies centering on student concerns and affairs. Some of these deal specifically with a continuing effort to better record, describe, and understand the characteristics of college-going individuals. These focus on urban and adult continuing/education participants as well as on the average college student. Also receiving attention, especially in evaluating effectiveness, are programs offered by the military and business communities. In addition, research is beginning to be focused on the participants in community service and adult education activities. Finally, relative to the above considerations, the well-known programs of testing, admissions, and studies of the impact of college are being refined and expanded--particularly with respect to the disadvantaged.

2. Many projects concentrate on aspects of finance in higher education. Some of these studies focus on the problem of how financial responsibility can be shared better. Others are concerned with exploring future patterns and alternatives for financing, based in part upon historical analysis. Of importance here is a study of the impact on the student of federal aid programs. Another study is exploring the implications of need, costs, and the concept of universal

higher education on the development of junior college programs. Several studies are under way to assess whether years in college or general ability level is related to the scalar increase in income. Finally, there are various specific studies covering topics such as physical facility projections for both the institutional and statewide levels and for the costs of medical buildings and of education in the health-related fields.

3. Studies of organization include further examination of the characteristics and problems of the various types of institutions of higher education. One of these focuses on the characteristics and roles of trustees. Another is exploring the governance of multi-campus university systems.

4. A smaller number of investigations are being concentrated on teaching/learning processes. A primary area of investigation is on the use of technological and other aids to achieve greater individualization of instruction and better utilization of teacher resources. Other studies are concerned with the training of good teachers and the development of valid measures of teacher effectiveness. One study is exploring the implications of instructional processes on the organizational patterns of higher education. Lastly, one agency exists primarily to encourage experimentation in teaching at the large campus where it is based.

5. Some research is being conducted on the organization, personnel, and utilization of research, and some is surveying research being done in specific areas. As mentioned earlier, there appears to be a definite movement toward problem, or policy-oriented research.

This is particularly encouraging because of the lack of variety and innovation exhibited in the few dissemination and development programs reported. It was further observed that very few agencies expressed specific knowledge of the activities of other agencies. Some agencies issue listings or bibliographies of projects in progress and make final reports available. Aside from these and the services of the ERIC clearing houses, dissemination activities consist mainly of conferences and seminars.

Perceived Gaps and Vacuums in Research

A number of those interviewed commented on the need for greater encouragement of innovation in both research and educational programs. Relative to innovation in educational programs, considerably more attention should be paid to development, testing, and evaluation.

A number of suggestions were made for investigations into what might best be termed the process of planning. Comprehensive studies of planning definitions, processes, and results are needed. Institutional self-studies should emphasize analyses of faculty values and interests, of changes in educational programs, and of the impact of the changes on other programs, finances, and governance. Also, little is known about the resources, planning procedures, and capabilities of private educational consulting firms, although they seem to enjoy a high level of prestige and acceptability. We need to assess their real capabilities and decide how to make the most effective use of their services. Too, evaluation of both British and Canadian planning efforts would prove helpful to new research and planning activities

in the United States. Further, research is necessary on what kinds of programs provide the best experience and education for training academic administrators in higher education--especially planners. Finally, more exploration should be made of computer-based management and planning models, including management information systems and their impact on higher education.

Other comments fell into five general categories: the organization of higher education, finance, teaching and learning, student characteristics, and research itself. The order in which these categories are presented roughly indicates the relative amounts of reaction from those interviewed.

Studies of new forms or models of higher education and their organization were of primary concern to the reporting agencies. The complex problems arising out of the rapid shifts in power among governing boards, administrators, faculty senates, faculty unions, student organizations, and extra-institutional groups, also need thorough researching and analysis. Of growing importance will be the impact of court decisions as faculty and student militancy leads to legal confrontations. Research is also required to determine to what extent accrediting agencies force institutions into conformity or allow and encourage innovative change. Within this context, research is needed on the role of technical and/or vocational training, and the viability of establishing separate institutions as opposed to carrying on this work in existing types of junior and senior colleges.

Further, changes in individual disciplines and in the relationships between departments as a result of individualized study and

the creation of new centers and institutes are little understood. We also need study of the growing acceptance of personal lifelong involvement with higher education and the impact this has for planning and financing and for the kinds of institutions which should be involved. Closely related to this is the need for inquiry into the growing problems of articulation, particularly with secondary education, but also between junior and senior colleges. Finally, although many new programs of instruction, some very experimental, are being offered, and new governance and administrative configurations are being tried, little is known about what really "works" and what does not.

The most important question with regard to financing higher education is the impact which the various forms of aid have had on students, institutions, states, etc.; particularly the impact of federal aid given directly to students. How have careers and values been changed? Also, little is known about the extent of the "financial crises" for public or private education and of the causes for these crises. Several researchers saw a need for comprehensive studies of the economic returns to society of providing higher education for a greater proportion of the population and of carrying education to higher degree levels. Finally, formulas used or contemplated for use for aid to individuals, programs, institutions, states, etc. need to be clarified or developed and then carefully assessed for their consequences to the many different aspects of higher education.

Considerable attention was given to teaching and learning considerations. Before higher education can validly plan for change,

much more needs to be known about the learning process. It seems imperative that such research be directed toward students who fall below the median in test scores, class rank, and family income level. Better knowledge of "lower-half" young people should provide bases for more appropriate programs and instructional methods. Further, in order to stimulate more productive faculty-student relationships, there is need for in-depth studies of the values, attitudes, training, and aspirations of faculties, similar to those that have been conducted on students. Profitable and necessary, too, would be investigations of personal and institutional freedoms and codes of conduct under stresses to which both students and academic staff are currently subjected. Many opportunities for inquiry are also offered by the rapidly growing problem of the transfer of knowledge between fields.

Although a respectable body of empirical data about students has been developed, continuing research is necessary. Needed most is research into means for stimulating their motivation and their aspirations, and for developing appropriate educational processes for educating and working with them. Thus, a need exists for additional studies of college environments and their effects on students, with particular emphasis on use of highly refined productivity measures and tests of performance. Directly related to these points, further explorations of both admissions policies and the "fit" between students and institutions are demanded.

Research into the many facets of research and development is seen by some agencies as a vacuum area. Little is known of the effectiveness of policy-oriented research versus basic research and of

the various techniques for dissemination of findings to decision-makers. Creative and effective new means need to be developed, tested, and evaluated.

Anticipated Research

Each agency was asked to indicate the planning-related research with which they expect to become involved in the near future. Although the responses to this question were surprisingly vague in many cases, some interesting and potentially fruitful areas of investigation were reported. One area of broad interest was that of generating and examining alternative future forms for higher education, with particular emphasis on the utilization of interaction computers and simulation models. Similarly, a study will be devoted to examining new campus educational configurations. Another closely related subject was the development of information and models for national policy formulation with special reference to anticipated new forms of higher education. A planned investigation of the interaction between universities and their geographical, social, economic and political environments has special relevance for urban institutions. The importance of exploring the aspirations and training of planning-oriented academic administrative careers was re-emphasized by plans for such a study. Also, at least one agency has tentative plans for investigating the impact of financial aid on students' choices of programs and institutions.

The scarcity of research centers which had planned programs of research for the immediate future is of itself significant, for most

of these agencies are subjected to the vagaries of annual funding by foundations or the government. They find it unprofitable to put resources into planning their own future until they can ascertain what new subjects have become popular for funding.

Beyond this, it seems evident that some researchers were indeed thinking about future projects when they discussed their ideas about areas which have not been covered by research. They may have been reluctant to identify themselves with any one of their proposals, pending further thought that would lead to the actual design of a project.

Possible Research Agencies for National Planning

Many of the agencies in which interviews were held have unique but limited research contributions to make to higher education. Much of this research is basic and not policy-oriented. Some of their researches have significance for national and other planning (e.g., on student and faculty characteristics, profiles of institutions, and the economic impact of new colleges on environment), but the agencies may not think of research in terms of developmental possibilities. Much of the research of some agencies has little to do either with higher education, directly or indirectly, except in part.

On the other hand, a few of the many agencies visited stand out as having exceptional potential for conducting various types of policy-planning research at the national level. This potential may be reflected by the agency's completed sponsored research, its current research, its general reputation, its ability to organize and conduct large-scale research on social-economic-political problems,

its stated objectives and interests in conducting research in higher education, and its demonstrated potential for attracting capable professional researchers to undertake the tasks.

Using these criteria, the staff has identified, and lists with a short description, each of those agencies having excellent potential or broad capability for doing research for a national planning body.

1. The Brookings Institution

Both the history and the overall reputation of this agency make it one of the most logical organizations for conducting future research on policy matters, particularly those relating to economic, financial, and political issues. Studies of Government Finance and the Government Studies Program are two long-term research projects which could have some relevance to our concern. For example, the latter program covers the area of social economics, and includes current research on "Education and Poverty," "The Public Financing of Higher Education," and other related topics.

As the Brookings Institution operates primarily on contracts, it has the flexibility needed to deal with large or small research projects on either an ad hoc or continuing basis. Both its temporary and semipermanent staff appear to be exceedingly able.

By offering fellowships and professorships, it maintains a competent number of scholars and researchers. Through an Advanced Study Program, it communicates the meaning and implications of its research to individuals in public and private positions of leadership. Also

worthy of note is its practice of making its facilities available to nonprofit research and educational organizations.

2. College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB)
   Educational Testing Service (ETS)
   American College Testing Program (ACT)

These three agencies have rather well known programs and interests in the areas of large scale testing and admissions. CEEB and ETS cooperate on a formal basis with other organizations and agencies on projects not primarily related to testing and admissions. ACT has grown to become a formidable competitor with CEEB and ETS. It also is heavily and efficiently engaged in research which has implications for local, state, and national planning.

Four emphases are predominant in recent and current CEED research: 1) quality control studies of tests; 2) studies of student access to higher education; 3) consultations on state surveys; and 4) studies of bias in test instruments. Much of the actual research is contracted to other agencies (e.g., ETS). Although future research projections are somewhat unclear, two major interests will dominate: 1) continued monitoring of the flow of students into and among institutions of higher education, and 2) studies of systems for achieving a better fit between students, career opportunities, and institutions. It would appear that almost all of these research emphases are important to planners and planning.

The vast majority of research activity at ETS derives from contracts with CEEB. All of the CEEB control studies of test quality are

conducted by ETS. The activities of two ETS Divisions--those in higher education and junior colleges--are related only indirectly to either policy development or planning.

ACT testing and evaluation activities have grown to the point where they now have a very strong base for research. This agency is involved in three types of student-related research: 1) services to institutions re follow-up studies, institutional profiles, etc.; 2) applied research re norming of guidance profiles; and 3) developmental and basic studies on students and college environments. The implications of ACT research for policy formulation and planning are limited but clear.

3. Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE)

Each of these regional organizations enjoys an excellent reputation. Their organization, representation, and programs make them particularly influential in state and inter-institutional policy formulation. Their research activities are primarily problem- or action-oriented, with similar emphases exhibited in comprehensive dissemination programs. Finally, their respective experiences in regional coordination and planning should provide excellent insights for a national endeavor.

SREB has addressed itself to the particular problems of higher education in the South for over twenty years. Consequently, it has a reputation for exerting influence with Southern governors, legislators, university administrators, predominantly Negro institutions,

and national organizations. Its major current research efforts are being directed toward providing education for the lowest economic groups. Particular emphasis is being given to the programs of junior colleges in the South.

WICHE presently conducts 26 programs, of which 16 are considered ongoing. Physical and mental health studies seem to dominate. WICHE tends to look upon itself as a problem-solving agency with particular concern for the failure of societal institutions--especially institutions of higher education. Its programs are aimed, therefore, at encouraging greater institutional commitment and relevancy. One of its programs calls for establishing a model for management information systems for institutional, statewide, and regional purposes. Data would be based on common definitions and thus results could be compared across both institutional and state lines. This project alone has great significance for the future planning of higher education at every level.

4. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education

The Commission has contracted over 27 research projects on various problems relevant to the future of higher education in the United States. The greatest number are in the areas of finance, economics, and governance. Also in process or planned is research related to professional education, the student, political issues, comparative analysis of foreign educational systems, the historical development of higher education, and innovational possibilities.

These projects will result in publications, and they will serve, in part, as the basis for the recommendations the Commission will

make in its final report, due by the early 1970s, when the commissions five-year period expires.

The Carnegie Commission is undoubtedly one of the most significant of its kind in bringing data and opinion together to influence decision-making and policy.

5. Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara

Unlike all other research agencies visited during this survey, the Center uses the method of "dialogue" as its principle "research tool." That is, the coterie of "fellows" on full-time assignment with the Center hold the methods of exchange and discussion of ideas as their principle means of scholarly encounter. Problems examined are initially chosen by the fellows who, as members of the Center, are "devoted to clarifying basic issues confronting a democratic society." Certain activities of the Center and several papers published by staff focus squarely on major issues in higher education. Selected titles illustrate this focus: Students and Society; The Muddle of Education; The University: What's Wrong With It? What Should It Be? How Can It Be Achieved?; The University in America; and Letters to the Regents.

The Center's actual and potential contribution to nationwide policy evaluation and analysis in higher education is revealed through the activities mentioned above. Moreover, special competencies, as shown in the wide-ranging backgrounds and experiences of their staff plus their unique approach to study and analysis, point up the potential importance of the Center's work to national planning in higher education. The Center's expertise would be of invaluable service,

especially on philosophical or value-ladened issues, such as alternative futures of society,which now receive only minimal attention in most discussions about higher education.

6. National Opinion Research Council, University of Chicago

This organization is best known for the high quality of its survey work in public opinion on a wide variety of economic, social, and political matters. It engages primarily in contract work with both government agencies and private organizations. In the past year or so it has begun conducting research of greater depth than its traditional surveys, and is considering some specific research on program evaluation in higher education. It has applied to the Carnegie Corporation for funding.

The long-standing reputation and the quality of the permanent staff of this agency commend it as one for doing opinion survey work for a national planning body.

7. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

The Institute's staff of scholars has shown high research productivity in economic and political areas and in business and government organization. The Carnegie Commission has several contracts with the Institute. Educational research proposed interrelates the college or university to the social, political, and economic environment in which it is located. Mutual impacts are to be studied.

The potential of the Institute for undertaking research of high quality is exceptionally high, with few other agencies in the nation reflecting equal capabilities. Its staff is drawn from leading scholars

in their respective fields, providing a strong interdisciplinary base for designing projects and evaluating results. Policy-oriented research is as much a tradition of the Institute as is basic research. Practically all of the research undertaken is on a contract with other public and private agencies. This is a resource to be relied upon by a national planning body.

8. Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University

This agency has concerned itself with several different research interests over the years with respect to education. Presently, there are many studies which conceivably bear on national planning. These studies tend to focus on three main areas of interest--organizations, the professions, and the relationship of the professions and organizations to the environment and the flow of human resources. For example, the Bureau has examined people in charge of selecting students and providing financial assistance to them. Another cluster of studies looks at the utilization of research by various institutions and agencies. Several projects study how human resources flow through the educational system. The characteristics of the college student body and of college graduates have been examined. Finally, three studies investigate the flow from colleges, namely, into the Peace Corps, the accounting profession, and vocational roles as trainees in educational research.

9. Institute for Policy Analysis, University of Toronto

Ongoing research includes a variety of interrelated projects concerned with the development of efficient management information systems

for colleges and universities. They are highly quantitative and highly dependent on computer facilities. Research is oriented to single institutions and systems of institutions (mainly the former). Presently, the Institute stages seminars to train administrators in the use of CAMPUS (an acronym for Comprehensive Analytical Model for Planning in the University Sphere). Plans for the future bring more attention to alternative futures for higher education, such as major utilization of the new technologies. The Institute works locally with the Committee on University Affairs. It has worked with the State University Construction Fund (New York) on facilities projections.

10. American Institutes for Research

This large and complex research organization has four separate offices (Pittsburgh, Washington, Palo Alto, and Asia/Pacific), with distinct research programs at each location. It is impossible in this space to summarize the numerous individual research projects of current or potential significance to national planning in higher education. It should be noted that AIR's work in education has focused mainly on the elementary and secondary levels (e. g., project TALENT). Nevertheless, some of the findings, methodologies, and concepts will likely have transfer value to higher education. Work in such broad areas as the following are worth noting: educational media, innovative systems of instruction, and non-graded individualized instructional programs (project PLAN).

Newly Created Centers

Three other Centers, which are still in early formative and organizational stages, may eventually have the characteristics of the agencies listed above. These may be reviewed in the future, to assess the scope and quality of their programs and the expertness of their staffs.

Within the last year, a new program was initiated by the U.S Office of Education concerned with the future of education. This resulted in the establishment of two Educational Policy Research Centers (Syracuse and Stanford), which are completing their first year of operation. The Center at Syracuse hopes to devote approximately 50 percent of its effort during the coming year to several projects concerned with educational futures. Much of this work will focus on policy questions about the individualization of instruction, alternative organizational arrangements for education, and alternative funding patterns. The proposed other half of this Center's work would examine social futures (economic, technological, and political) and various methodological approaches to policy research.

The Educational Policy Research Center at Stanford plans to investigate seven study domains: basic assumption issues, patterns of utopia, contemporary revolutionary forces, methodologies, societal interactions, derivations of alternative futures, and educational policy issues. Following what they refer to as a "needs-values-belief approach," they intend to produce three principal research reports--one dealing with methodologies, a second with alternative futures to the year 2000, and a third with educational policy issues.

The Institute for Higher Education, Teachers College, has not yet conducted research with direct implications for planning. However, they may undertake one or more projects which focus on such questions as the impact of scholarships on the students who receive them, and various other "impact studies" of federally sponsored programs in higher education.

A Word About the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education University of California, Berkeley

This report does not include any information about the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley, either with respect to its current and projected research and development program, or the points of view of its staff on such matters as federal aid to higher education and alternatives for advising government.

Because of its long history and the magnitude of the Center's research program, it seemed inappropriate to attempt to summarize it within the confines of the report. The Center's last annual report is included as a supplement, as a means of indicating the nature and scope of its activities. It will be noted that to date the research program has concentrated on three areas: the college student and the impact of college on student development; the various aspects and issues of governance; and planning at both the institutional and state levels. It is probably safe to say that the Center already has or soon will have more research data on these areas than any other agency in the country.

In January 1969, the staff began an intensive review of the entire research and development program in terms of its logical direction for the future. A full report of the staff decisions, including the thinking and reactions of individual consultants and external advisory committees, will be completed by July 1. It may be said here, however, that although the Center will continue to allocate a certain amount of its resources to basic research, an

increasing emphasis will be placed on policy-oriented research and development activities. Much of such research and development will be devoted to the relationship between governance configurations and the learning environment, with implications for planning. For the most part, research will be programmatic and interdisciplinary.

APPENDIX 1

INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS SURVEYED

West

Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration
University of Oregon

Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions
Santa Barbara, California

Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instructional Programs
University of California at Los Angeles

Center for Research and Development in Teaching
Stanford University

Educational Policy Research Center
Menlo Park, California

Office of Analytical Studies
University of California, Berkeley

Institute of Governmental Studies
University of California, Berkeley

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

American Institutes for Research
Palo Alto, California

Midwest

American College Testing Program
Iowa City, Iowa

Battelle Memorial Institute
Cleveland, Ohio

Center for Urban Studies
Wayne State University, Detroit

Center for Research on Learning and Teaching
University of Michigan

Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Michigan

Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan

Center for Research and Training in Higher Education
University of Cincinnati, Ohio

National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago

National Institute for the Study of Educational Change
Indiana University

Social Systems Research Institute
University of Wisconsin

East

School of Education
Syracuse University

Center for Adult and Continuing Education
Syracuse University

Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs
Syracuse University

SURC Policy Institute
Syracuse University

SURC Educational Policy Research Center
Syracuse University

College Entrance Examination Board
New York

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

Brookings Institution
Washington, D. C.

Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University

Institute for Higher Education
Columbia University

Bureau of Social Science Research
Washington, D. C.

The Urban Institute
Washington, D. C.

Center for Policy Research
Washington, D. C.

Harvard Graduate School of Education
Harvard University

Institute for Policy Analysis
University of Toronto

Institute for Higher Education
University of Florida

Resources for the Future
Washington, D. C.

Center for Continuing Liberal Education
Pennsylvania State University

Educational Research Center
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Sloan School of Management
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Regional Higher Education Boards

Southern Regional Education Board
Atlanta, Georgia

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
Boulder, Colorado

Committee on Institutional Cooperation
West Lafayette, Indiana

ERIC Clearing Houses

George Washington University (Higher Education)

Columbia University (The Disadvantaged)

University of Michigan (Counseling and Personnel Services)

University of California at Los Angeles (Junior College Information)

University of Oregon (Educational Administration)

Syracuse University (Adult and Continuing Education)

Consulting Firms

Cresap, McCormick, and Paget

Arthur D. Little, Inc.

Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Co.

McKinsie Co.

APPENDIX 2

Interview Schedule

Research

1. What current research is being done by your agency?

   Which parts of your research relate to or could be related to:

   a. Institutional planning or policy

   b. State planning or policy

   c. National planning or policy

2. What research do you plan or wish to engage in in the near future?

3. What gaps or vacuum areas need researching?

4. What dissemination and development program is undertaken in relation to your research?

   What should be done?

Planning Evaluation

1. What planning at the institutional, state, or national level do you have or know about?

   Which agencies are doing good research which would be helpful in planning at state and national levels?

2. Which agencies are really doing good planning for state level? for national level?

   Why do you consider the plans effective? (Interdisciplinary? Many people or agencies involved? Communications with constituent

groups affected?)

3. Why do so many planning efforts fail?

4. What factors allow for success of some plans?

Future Change Anticipated

Various persons have suggested new directions, new emphases, and new structures for higher education in the future. Proposals include mechanisms or arrangements for greater student mobility, faculty exchange, work-study programs, and inter-institutional co-operative academic programming. More radical ideas focus on full utilization of the new technologies, elimination of lecture/discussion methods, maximization of independent study and tutorials, and new types of institutions with very open and flexible curricula. Could you share with us some of your thinking about how higher education might be different in the future? What new assumptions, new hypotheses, and new configurations for learning ought to be examined and possibly researched in regard to alternative futures for higher education?

National Involvement

Federal Aid:

1. If the federal government is to provide a greater share of the funds in the future, how should those funds be distributed? What are best ways?
   a. Categorical grants to institutions
   b. Categorical grants to states, then to institutions
   c. Block grants to institutions? to states?

d. Directly administered grants to institutions?

(Consider proposals such as those made by Kerr, Rivlin, Bowen, et al).

National Plan:

1. With increasing federal support probable, what is your attitude toward a national plan for higher education?
2. What objectives should be sought through a plan?
3. Who should participate in developing the plan?
4. What is your opinion about various proposals which have been made for a National Planning Congress or Higher Education Advisory Council:
   a. Kerr
   b. Wescoe
   c. Rivlin
   d. Pifer
   e. Eurich
5. If such a Congress were to be formed, what ought the relationships to be between the Congress and
   a. Various research centers
   b. Professional associations
   c. Institutions
   d. State planning agencies

Other Activities of Our Staff

1. Evaluate quality of work done or proposed at each center.
2. Get opinion as to "best" research centers.
3. Decide on specific niche which a particular center might fill in providing alternatives and ongoing research for national planning.

APPENDIX 3

Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley
February 13, 1969

PROPOSED PROJECT

Study of National Planning in Higher Education

Nature of the Project

The Center proposed to undertake for the Academy of Educational Development a project which would examine the content and process of current planning and alternative goals for higher education national planning. The principal group from which both types of information would be gathered would be the agencies currently devoted to research and planning in higher education. This group includes nationally recognized university-based research centers, recently established policy centers, regional agencies such as SREB and WICHE involved in planning for higher education, special groups such as the Carnegie Commission, and certain of the ERIC clearing houses. Some university departments of higher education and bureaus of institutional research may also be considered as to their future potential in contributing toward national planning and supporting research. Consultation with certain national associations such as the ACE and

Land Grant Association, and with AIR and AERA, may also be desirable. The attached list of agencies is suggestive of those which will be involved in the inventory.

More specifically, the Center would:

1. Organize and conduct a series of meetings or visitations over the next few months with key staff members of certain research agencies and centers around the country. Other agencies will be contacted by mail or telephone.

2. Plan the field visits to serve two general purposes.

   First: Obtain information (including documents) about the content and process of current planning in higher education to answer such questions as: In what kinds of activities is your agency engaged that relate to planning in higher education (e.g., research on planning, actually doing planning, etc.)? From your experience, what agencies or centers provide effective planning in higher education? What reasons account for this effectiveness? What do you see as major areas in which higher education planning has been least effective and why? Of the current problem areas, or those you foresee in the future, which are most in need of research? What are the vacuum areas?

   Second: Seek opinions about alternative mechanisms and goals for national planning in higher education, asking such questions as: Of the several futuristic models suggested for the organization and structure of higher education, which appear to have the greatest potential for ful-

fillment of the goals of higher education? What relevance do the better models have for the planning of higher education, especially at the national level? What are your reactions to the various proposals which have been suggested for a National Planning Congress, Higher Education Council, etc.? What services should such an agency perform? How should it be composed and organized so that all major components of higher education can participate in the development of various plans and facilitate their implementation? What are the major needs in higher education to which a national plan should be addressed? What forms of financial aid should Federal participation take in the future?

3. Prepare an overall summary of the various meetings and findings, along with whatever conclusions we may wish to draw, by May 1, 1969.

4. Discuss the project at special meetings which may be called by the USOE staff, by AED, or by certain of the associations interested in the project (e.g., ACE Commission on Federal Relations, AAC Executive Committee, National Planning Congress Steering Committee, etc.)